has rejected claims 5-7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schwelb et al. in view of Marui (U.S. Patent No. 4,959,850). The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schwelb et al. in view of Klatt ("Review of text-to-speech conversion for English"). The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schwelb et al. in view of Klatt and further in view of Marui.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner stated that the claim is anticipated by Schwelb et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The methods disclosed in Schwelb et al. for converting textual messages into an audible format by use of a voice synthesizer do not disclose a voice synthesizer contained in a hands free kit. In the Schwelb et al. methods a voice synthesizer is contained in either a base station or a mobile station, ***not*** in the hands free kit. The apparatus contained in the present application discloses a handset coupled to a hands free kit or hands free kit circuitry for synthesizing speech sounds as recited in claim 1. The element of a hands free kit having circuitry for synthesizing speech sounds is not contained in Schwelb et al.

Additionally, with respect to claim 1, Schwelb et al. does not disclose the element recited in claim 1 of transferring an alarm signal to the hands free kit to generate an alarm to inform a user of the receipt of a short message.

And finally with respect to claim 1, Schwelb et al. does not disclose transferring the short message to the hands free kit when a short message calling signal is received from the hands free kit.

The interaction between the handset and the hands free kit comprising transferring the alarm signal, generating the alarm, receiving the calling signal, and transferring the

short message, as recited in claim 1, is neither taught nor disclosed by Schwelb et al.

Independent claim 8 was also rejected as being anticipated by Schwelb et al. Applicant again respectfully disagrees. Claim 8 clearly recites a handset coupled to a hands free kit, handset circuitry to transfer short messages to the hands free kit, and hands free kit circuitry to synthesize speech sounds. Regarding the elements recited in claim 8, arguments analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 1 clearly apply. Schwelb et al. does not disclose hands free kit circuitry to synthesize speech sounds. Schwelb et al. does not disclose handset circuitry to transfer short messages the hands free kit. As such, claim 8 is neither taught nor disclosed by Schwelb et al.

The Examiner states that claim 5 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schwelb et al. in view of Marui. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In addition to the disclosure of Schwelb et al., Marui discloses a radio telephone having a voice recognition function and a voice dial mode. Arguments analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 1 are applicable with respect to claim 5. The interaction between the handset and the hands free kit comprising receiving the alarm signal, generating the alarm, detecting speech input, detecting if speech input is a sound synthesis command, transmitting a calling signal, and receiving the short message from the handset as recited in claim 5 are neither taught nor disclosed by Schwelb et al. nor Marui et al., or any combination thereof.

Claim 9 was rejected as being unpatentable over Schwelb et al. in view of Marui. Claim 9 recites handset circuitry operative to transfer an alarm signal the hands free kit upon the receipt of a short message, and hands free kit circuitry adapted to generate an alarm and receive input speech, and to synthesize the speech sounds. Neither Schwelb et al nor Marui et al., or any combination thereof, teaches or discloses these elements as

recited in claim 9.

Independent Claims 1, 5 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 9-10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 9-10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining maters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM